



\$~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 5453/2025 & CRL.M.A. 23403/2025**

BILKISH SAIYAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yogesh Gupta, Ms. Sakshi Jain
and Mr. Abhishek Shandilya, Advs. with the
petitioner in person

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
with Ms. Upasna Bakshi, Adv. along with SI
Meena, PS Maurya Enclave
Respondent no. 2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

16.10.2025

%

1. The instant petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter "BNSS") [earlier Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter "CrPC")] has been filed by the petitioner praying for quashing of FIR no. 20/2024 registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave for the offences punishable under Section 376/506/323/341 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter "IPC"). Though the FIR was registered under Section 376 of the IPC, the chargesheet later filed modified the allegations against the petitioner, limiting the same to Section 506 of the IPC.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the complainant was coerced into non-consensual physical relations with one Vishal Verma. The petitioner in



the present matter was not involved into the offence of rape that had been alleged against Vishal Verma. She was an acquaintance to him, who was alleged to have threatened the complainant to stay away from Vishal. However, it is alleged that the petitioner entered respondent no. 2's house on 23.12.2023 and snatched her mobile phone, threatening to leak her explicit pictures on social media.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 have settled their disputes amicably and are now moving forward towards a peaceful and harmonious future. However, respondent no. 2, on being asked for her intention behind agreeing to quash proceedings, states that pendency of the present proceedings is causing undue harassment. She further states that she is residing on a rented premises along with her younger sister and has no surviving parents. Her life, as it stands, is already burdened with several hardships and the continuation of the present criminal proceedings only cause her further distress and impede her efforts to move forward.

4. Respondent no. 2 has agreed to withdraw the case arising out of FIR no. 20/2024 registered at Police Station Maurya against the petitioner.

5. It is prayed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties that the instant FIR may be quashed on the basis of the compromise.

6. Learned APP for the State, who appears on advance notice, accepts notice and submits that there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. The petitioner is present before this Court and have been identified by their counsel and Investigating Officer, Police Station Maurya Enclave.



Respondent no. 2 is also present in the Court and has been identified by her counsel and the Investigating Officer.

9. Ordinarily, allegations of such a nature would not warrant quashing of FIR. However, it is equally well recognized that where the continuation of criminal proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose, and where the prosecutrix, being a consenting adult, has settled the matter voluntarily and without pressure, the Court may exercise its inherent powers to secure the ends of justice.

10. In the present case, both the parties are adults. The prosecutrix has chosen to put the matter to rest and move ahead in life, this Court deems it appropriate to give quietus to the proceedings.

11. Also, on repeated queries made by this Court, respondent no. 2 has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise on her own free will, without any coercion, undue influence or pressure. She further affirms that the entire dispute has been amicably resolved between the parties.

12. Keeping in view the fact that the matter stands amicably settled between the petitioner and respondent no. 2 without any pressure, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the matter pending.

13. It is, thus, in the interest of justice to quash the afore-mentioned FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

14. Hence, in light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab* (2012) 10 SCC 303**, FIR bearing no. 20/2024 registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave for the offences punishable under Section 376/506/323/341 of the IPC, and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed *qua* the present petitioner.



15. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025

Sk/av